



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Posidonius on rhetoric. I cite from Plut. Pomp. 42; 'In Rhodes Pompey heard all the scholars and gave each one a present of a talent; but Posidonius even composed or wrote out the lecture which he held before him, having prepared it *in reply to Hermagoras*, about the principles of rhetoric in general'. This *πρὸς Ἑρμαγόραν* of Plutarch's text has deceived the editors of Cicero's Brutus and many others. One can hold a lecture in reply to, or in rejoinder to or for subversal of the current doctrine or theory of the most eminent representative of a widely prevailing system, without having that authority present in the flesh, or even alive. But this Jahn and the others overlooked and thus created impossibilities. There *was* a theory of *status* everywhere, but it seems the *τεχνουργοί* not always accepted the classification of Hermagoras. In Quintil. 3. 6. 31 ff. Some put two, as did Appollodorus (who taught Octavianus); so also Theodorus though with a radically different theory. And then Posidonius himself is named, who had also two large classes of *στάσεις*.

But this will do to clear the matter.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

E. G. SIHLER.

LITERATURE VERSUS PHILOLOGY

For some time in public discussion and private conversation a wordy war has been waged between the partisans of Literature on the one side and the partisans of Philology on the other, while those who have not felt called upon to take either side have stood apart and watched the fray, either as spectators interested in the outcome, or as mere lovers of a good fight. As is usual in wars many of the warriors in either camp do not understand what the fight is all about, but having taken sides, they are doing their best to put their antagonists out of business. It is the leaders—and by these we mean those who have written on the subject for publication—who are stirring up all the disturbance. Yet even in their case one cannot help feeling that some of them are as bewildered in respect of the real point at issue as are many of the rank and file.

The leaders on the side of literature say that their opponents, whom they stigmatize as 'narrow philologists' and 'gerund-grinders', do not teach literature in such a way as to ennoble and enrich the minds of their pupils, but give them the dry husks of a dead and deadening study of the dry bones of an inanimate skeleton, while the 'narrow philologist', thus rudely awakened from his intensive study of this 'subject' which we call language, is beginning to fight in self-defense, at the same time casting about in his mind for good and valid arguments by using which as a club he may pound some sense into the heads of his adversaries.

In this, as in every question debatable with arguments or fists, there are two sides, and if we can

call a halt in the conflict we may be able to show to all concerned that they really agree in all essentials as well as in most of the details.

Literature—in the dictionaries there are many definitions—is that which is written in the noblest language and gives enlightenment and pleasure in their noblest forms. No one, not even the philologist, will for a moment deny that the study of literature, as thus defined, will be of exceeding value to the student. Yet, in spite of the fact that there are high-school pupils who 'understand Shakespeare perfectly', it is true that literature cannot be understood, or even enjoyed, until the mind of the pupil has been educated by easy, not *too* easy, stages to the point where it can feel the thrill of pleasure which comes from association with the best minds through the medium of the best literature.

Now everyone thinks that he understands his mother-tongue; some are even conceited enough to say that they understand two or more languages, but when a test is made the subject is brought to see that he did not know what it was 'to understand'. Hence the need for English, Course A, and Rhetoric, Course B, as well as for courses in other languages; hence the need for the intensive study of mere words that the student may be sure that from the possible meanings he can choose the one which will fit in any given case. A *brown* hat is something we have all seen, but what does Dante mean when he says, "e l'aer *bruno* toglieva gli animai"? One might make a guess and pass on—to other guesses, but if he does he will not understand the poet. The answer to this might be that the teacher's duty is to make such explanation as is necessary to insure clear understanding on the part of the pupil. 'No', answers the philologist, 'for how does the teacher know that he is right? Does he hand down a continuous, unbroken tradition from the poet? How does the pupil know that the teacher gives the correct interpretation? In your statement lies the crux of the whole question. Tradition deadens, while investigation gives life. Points once seemingly settled must be reinvestigated by every age, lest the very life of thought die and the human mind shrivel'.

If we seek for side-lights to aid us in finding a solution of our question and turn to the natural sciences for help, everywhere we find minute and painstaking pursuit of knowledge. The scientist of to-day is not content with the theories and explanations of the past; the physician of to-day is not the physician of to-morrow, unless he is content to be left behind in the march of progress. Not only does science seek for a knowledge of facts which may at once be made of practical value to many, but it studies matters whose practical value it would be very difficult to demonstrate to any but the initiated. The young student is at first set at performing experiments which have been performed by thousands of

students before him and will be performed by thousands of students after him. This is done that he may be trained in the use and actions of the materials with which he must work and that the results which he obtains may be checked up by the known results which he ought to obtain. Not till the learner has shown familiarity with and accuracy in the use of his materials is he allowed to go on with the study of minor questions, the answer to which is not already known. When he has shown his ability to cope with minor studies, because of accuracy, application, and the power of marshaling causes and effects in proper sequence, the learner is on the high road to the city of truth.

To return now to the point at issue. The teacher of literature and the philologist have much in common and must work by methods fundamentally the same in point of accuracy and minuteness. The philologist (according to the narrowest definition) makes language itself the subject of his study, but he must bring to his work many aids, philosophy, phonetics, history. When, for example, he applies himself to the task of following the vagaries of a Greek particle through its long life of centuries, he has set himself no mean task. It requires powers of the same order as those required by the teacher of literature. Because he deals with substances invisible to the naked eye is the microscopist narrower than the astronomer who uses a telescope and studies immense suns millions of miles distant from our earth? The teacher of literature must be at least enough of a philologist to use the apparatus which the philologist has prepared for him, while the philologist must be able to understand the author's thought if he would understand the language used to express that thought.

If the partisan of literature says, "What you say is granted, but you are beside the point. Our quarrel is not that the philologist is not a useful animal, but that philologists are in power and wish to make all students philologists like themselves. And when they have had their way they turn out fledglings who, not having their masters' power, but robe themselves in their masters' cloak and hat, and give to minds still more immature mental food of exceeding indigestibility". To which the philologist retorts, "Yes, but you would give to those same immature minds a sense for literature when they have not the mentality to receive it. Those minds must be trained by the study of language before they can understand literature. There are already too many untrained, illogical teachers by word or pen who foist upon an unthinking world 'studies' and 'appreciations' which are nonsense. Who, who, after all the labor you have expended on them, will read the books on the 'five-foot shelf' rather than the 'six best sellers' of the day?"

But wait, friends! Do you not see that each of

you is necessary to the other? and that each must use the other's method, if he wishes to obtain the best results? The whole question is a matter of emphasis, and, as usual, too great attention to one side of the question will obscure the validity of the arguments for the other side. As regards the fact that the newly fledged Ph. D. gives to his immature pupils food which they do not yet need and, therefore, cannot digest, that is merely the fault of youth and inexperience, and will be remedied by the young teacher's growing sense of proportion. Whether he will ever become a great teacher of literature or a great philologist depends on time and temperament. Teach him how to walk and let him do the climbing.

HAMILTON FORD ALLEN.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE.

REVIEWS

A Handbook of Greek Archaeology. By Harold North Fowler and James Rignall Wheeler, with the collaboration of Gorham Phillips Stevens. New York: American Book Company (1909). Pp. 559. \$2.00.

The appearance of this manual, the work of the Editor-in-Chief of the *American Journal of Archaeology* and the Chairman of the Managing Committee of the American School at Athens, will be welcomed not only by teachers and students of the Classics, but also by the wider circle of those who are interested in Greece and things Greek. All the older English manuals of Greek archaeology, such as Murray's Handbook and Collignon's Manual in the late Professor Wright's excellent translation, have been rendered hopelessly out of date by the rapid progress that has been made since the time of their publication, and the need of a brief and authoritative statement of the principal results of modern research has long been felt. To say that the new Handbook satisfies this need is to emphasize only one merit of the work. In fullness of treatment and of illustration it marks a distinct advance over its predecessors and the arrangement of the matter is clearer and more logical.

The book begins with an Introduction on the study and progress of classical archaeology in modern times and the first chapter is devoted to Prehistoric Greece. After this the treatment is topical: the remaining chapters discuss Architecture, Sculpture, Terracottas, Metal Work, Coins, Engraved Gems, and Painting and Mosaic. A select bibliography and an index complete the book. The chapter on architecture is the work of Mr. Stevens, revised by Professor Fowler, the chapters on vases and painting are by Professor Wheeler, and the other chapters are by Professor Fowler, but "both authors have read the book fully and accept responsibility for the statements contained in it".